Exhibit A

Case 2:19-cv-00048-NDF Document 26-2 Filed 04/18/19 Page 2 of 3



Adam Owens <adam.h.owens@gmail.com>

Biles v. Schneider - Extension of time to file

4 messages

Adam Owens <adam@granitepeaklaw.com>

Tue, Apr 16, 2019 at 2:59 PM

To: hand@spencelawyers.com, fleck@spencelawyers.com

Cc: Gregory Costanza <gregory@granitepeaklaw.com>, Julie Nelson <julie@granitepeaklaw.com>

Dear counsel,

I have been retained to represent Medport LLC in the Biles v. Schneider matter currently pending in Wyoming U.S. District Court. I have just returned to the office today after being in FL since 4/11/19.

My understanding is that Medport's answer to your client's complaint is due on 4/18/19 according to the returned summons filed by your office on 4/11/19, document no. 20.

Considering I have just established electronic communications with John Schneider, Medport's principal, last night, and I wasn't retained until yesterday. I am requesting additional time under local rule 6.1(b) for Medport to respond to your client's complaint. I am requesting the maximum 14 day extension to file Medport's answer to the complaint.

With your consent and in accordance with local rule 6.1(b) I will request a telephone conference call with the court to request the extension by oral motion.

Best,

Adam H. Owens Granite Peak Law PLLC P.O. Box 635 Bozeman, MT 59771 T: 406.530.9119 F: 406.794.0750 adam@granitepeaklaw.com www.granitepeaklaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the named recipients and is protected as a transmission under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or protected from disclosure under applicable law including, but not limited to, the attorney client privilege and/or work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this transmission, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and kindly destroy your copy of the transmission. Further, do not deliver, distribute or copy this transmission, disclose its contents or take any action in reliance on the information it contains.

Dan Fleck <fleck@spencelawyers.com>

Tue, Apr 16, 2019 at 4:57 PM

To: Adam Owens <adam@granitepeaklaw.com>

Cc: Kristeen Hand hand@spencelawyers.com, Gregory Costanza gregory@granitepeaklaw.com, Julie Nelson julie@granitepeaklaw.com

Mr. Owens- your client already filed an answer, and claims he is representing himself.

R. D. Fleck

Sent from my iPhone [Quoted text hidden]

1 of 2 4/18/2019, 12:44 PM

Case 2:19-cv-00048-NDF Document 26-2 Filed 04/18/19 Page 3 of 3

Adam Owens <adam@granitepeaklaw.com>

To: Dan Fleck <fleck@spencelawyers.com>

Tue, Apr 16, 2019 at 5:49 PM

Cc: Kristeen Hand hand@spencelawyers.com, Gregory Costanza gregory@granitepeaklaw.com, Julie Nelson julie@granitepeaklaw.com

Mr. Fleck,

This is not an answer to my question. Medport is a separate entity from Mr. Schneider and regardless of his answer Medport is permitted to have its own response to your client's allegations. In addition, as you are likely aware, as a separate legal entity, Medport's interests must be represented by counsel, not Mr. Schneider. I am in a difficult position of having very limited information about this case and need additional time to secure the relevant information to adequately represent my client, thus my request for an extension. So I will ask again, will you consent to me having an additional 14 days under local rule 6.1(B) to answer your client's complaint on behalf of Medport?

Best Regards,

Adam H. Owens Granite Peak Law PLLC P.O. Box 635 Bozeman, MT 59771 T: 406.530.9119 F: 406.794.0750 adam@granitepeaklaw.com www.granitepeaklaw.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the named recipients and is protected as a transmission under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. 2510-2521. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential and/or protected from disclosure under applicable law including, but not limited to, the attorney client privilege and/or work product doctrine. If you are not the intended recipient of this transmission, please notify the sender immediately by reply e-mail and kindly destroy your copy of the transmission. Further, do not deliver, distribute or copy this transmission, disclose its contents or take any action in reliance on the information it contains.

[Quoted text hidden]

Rd Fleck <rdfleck@gmail.com>

Tue, Apr 16, 2019 at 8:57 PM

To: Adam Owens <adam@granitepeaklaw.com>

Cc: Dan Fleck <fleck@spencelawyers.com>, Kristeen Hand <hand@spencelawyers.com>, Gregory Costanza <gregory@granitepeaklaw.com>, Julie Nelson <julie@granitepeaklaw.com>

Your office e filed his answer for Schneider and Medport. He asserted that Medport was his alter ego, and that he was representing and answering for himself and Medport. So since he answered, I'd say the point is moot.

Sent from my iPhone [Quoted text hidden]

2 of 2 4/18/2019, 12:44 PM